

Approved
MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 – 3:30 P.M.

Cumulative Attendance

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>	<u>May 2011 - April 2012</u>	
		<u>Present</u>	<u>Absent</u>
Steve Lucas, Chair (dep. 5:02)	P	4	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair	P	4	0
Jessie Adderley	P	4	0
Sonya Burrows (arr. 3:38)	P	3	0
Ron Centamore (dep. 6:03)	P	4	0
Nate Ernest-Jones	P	3	1
Alan Gabriel (dep. 6:03)	P	3	1
Mickey Hinton	P	3	1
Bradley Hubert	A	3	1
Brice Lambrix	P	3	1
Yvonne Sanandres	A	2	2
Doug Sterner	A	3	1
Scott Strawbridge	P	1	0
John Wilkes	P	2	2
Samuel Williams	P	4	0

Currently there are 15 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

Staff

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA
Sandra Doughlin, Clerk III, CRA
Diana Alarcon, Director of Sustainability
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Ms. Burrows, that the Board supports the overall concept and direction of the Flagler Village Civic Association Improvement Project. The Board reserves the right, however, to make its final comment or recommendation on the Project when more details, including cost, are available. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m. Roll was called and it was noted a quorum was present.

II. Approval of Minutes from June 28, 2011 Joint Workshop and July 27, 2011 Regular Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2011 joint workshop. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the July 27, 2011 regular meeting [as corrected].

Mr. Williams noted a correction on p.5, paragraph 7: "...there appear to be" should be "there need to be."

Chair Lucas noted a correction on p.5, paragraph 3: second sentence should read, "...suggested that in order to move forward, a simplified plan should be developed to attract investment."

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Burrows arrived at 3:38 p.m.

Presentation

III. Broward MPO Long Range Transportation Plan

Chair Lucas introduced Greg Stuart, Executive Director of the Broward County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and Chris Ryan, Public Information Officer of the MPO. The Chair explained that the Board is interested in understanding the long-term plans for transportation and how these affect the CRA.

Mr. Stuart explained that the MPO is funded by gas tax dollars generated within Broward. Their mission, in addition to transforming transportation, is to understand where the County is going economically. They do not compete with the surrounding counties, but with other communities across the nation. The Broward MPO has \$8.5 billion for the next 20 years. Mr. Stuart explained that the Long Range Transportation Plan is based on funds generated by the gas tax.

He referred the members to a PowerPoint presentation showing dedicated bus lanes within the County, as well as the routes of buses operating in mixed traffic. Mr. Stuart noted that there are discussions underway with Broward County Transit regarding the possibility of high-capacity transit in some areas. Other plans include signal prioritization for standard buses operating in mixed traffic, which would mean the operator will be able to press a button at an intersection to trigger a light change from red to green.

Mr. Stuart continued that another change new to Florida is the creation of mobility hubs. Riders can drive to mobility hubs and then take buses to leave the area. Each prospective hub in the Broward MPO will be built within the 20-year time frame of the Long Range Transportation Plan; a hub for Fort Lauderdale is expected to be funded in 2014. Smaller mobility hubs are called anchor hubs, and require a lesser amount of investment. These are expected to be created at Tri-Rail locations and separate areas where major routes are located. The smallest hubs are community hubs, which are locations where community shuttles such as the Sun Trolley will stop.

Mr. Stuart recommended that the Board members visit www.browardmpo.org , which shows what the different hubs might look like and where they may be located. The site also offers a wealth of information on safety, how to transfer between vehicles, and where facilities are located.

He moved on to discuss projects that will affect the CRA. The South Florida East Coast Corridor (FEC Corridor) hopes to add passenger rail to its system between Fort Lauderdale International Airport and downtown Miami. The MPO will work with them to ensure this system reaches the Sistrunk and Sunrise areas as well, and possibly further north, within the next few years. Private investors are willing to put up the capital to create this system.

There is also the Downtown Streetcar, or WAVE, project. Mr. Stuart said the MPO has submitted grant applications to the federal government to seek additional funding for this project, and hopes for a response before the end of 2011. He advised that the federal government may see this project as a significant economic development opportunity, as business leadership and transportation groups have expressed support for the WAVE. As proposed, the WAVE would run 2.5 miles round trip; however, it would be significant as the first phase of a streetcar system or network in Broward County.

Mr. Wilkes asked what the timeline for expansion of the WAVE might be. Mr. Stuart replied if the grant is awarded in 2011, the system could be underway in 2014 and open by 2016 in the downtown area. Advance work would then begin on the expansion to the Tri-Rail station and other areas. He noted that there must

be a \$75 million match to what the City, County, State, and Downtown Development Authority (DDA) have already committed to the project.

Chair Lucas requested more information on the Fort Lauderdale mobility hub. Mr. Stuart explained that this hub would be located on the "J" lot across the street from the helipad site, as this lot is owned by the City. The MPO would work with the City and the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) on this large-scale planning effort, as it will be a gateway to the City from I-95. Mr. Stuart advised that the MPO hopes to reach out to the public in February 2012 to learn what they want for this site. The MPO will bring the plans back before the CRA as they are developed.

Mr. Williams asked if any opportunities had been missed to work with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) stimulus funds. Mr. Stuart said they had not, stating that the MPO received approximately \$45 million in stimulus funds, which had advance-funded two local projects. He added that if the proposed federal jobs bill is passed, there will be funding opportunities for the WAVE project.

Mr. Lambrix asked how population growth is projected during the duration of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Mr. Stuart said these projections have been scaled down from 2.5 million to an estimated 2 million in Broward County by 2035. He noted that the mobility hubs are focused around CRAs throughout the County, as these are locations where approved development can occur.

Chair Lucas thanked Mr. Stuart and Mr. Ryan for their presentation. Mr. Ernest-Jones distributed fliers regarding MPO activity and upcoming public meetings, and encouraged the Board members to attend these meetings or submit comments via the MPO website.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

Discussion Item

IX. Flagler Village Civic Association Improvement Project

Chair Lucas recalled that one issue discussed at the joint workshop was connectivity, including street improvements through 9th, 7th, 3rd, and Andrews Avenue. He advised that the Civic Association includes volunteers who have put together some potential initiatives for Flagler Village. The Chair introduced Rick Powers and Allen Hooper.

Mr. Powers advised that he and other volunteers are working with the Flagler Village Civic Association to develop a comprehensive plan intended to improve

the pedestrian experience and promote economic development in the area. He stated that the volunteers are neither traffic engineers nor City planners. The plan would create complete streets to improve the pedestrian experience and promote traffic calming in the neighborhood. The complete streets plan would add trees, identify crosswalks for safety, and install streetlights and signage. Infrastructure changes, such as the addition of parking, would help spur development and enhance connectivity between the major downtown arteries and the riverfront.

Another part of the proposal would be off-street parallel parking, similar to what is done on Las Olas Boulevard. Traffic is restricted during rush hours but areas are open for parking during off-peak hours. Another important factor would be the addition of a bicycle lane on 3rd Avenue.

Mr. Powers stated that the plan is consistent with the City's Comprehensive Master Plan and is adaptable to the WAVE system discussed by Mr. Stuart. He advised that they would be working within the existing streets and rights-of-way, and are not proposing that the streets be redone. He explained that the volunteers are seeking the CRA's endorsement of the plan so they can move the project forward. The Flagler Village Association will support the work of City engineers and the DDA to make this project a reality.

He distributed copies of the concepts for the plan for Andrews and 3rd, noting that the concept of complete streets included adding trees along the sidewalk and introducing a planted median where a turning lane now exists. The turning lane would remain at a major intersection. Mr. Powers said these could be accomplished easily while working within the existing street. The visual also showed what off-peak parking would look like without restricting the number of lanes.

Mr. Hooper said the Flagler Village Civic Association and the volunteers are very energized regarding the project and want to see changes happen. He advised that retail has struggled in this area, as the sidewalks have not been kept up and the existing parallel parking is very close to the traffic lane. He identified the proposed median as a traffic calming device, and noted that allowing off-peak parallel parking would allow other types of businesses, such as restaurants and retail, to use those spaces toward their parking requirements.

He asserted that projects like this one can turn a neighborhood around, and new sidewalks, new businesses, and new sidewalks would contribute to the area's success.

Mr. Gabriel advised that a zoning change would be appropriate for the Flagler Village area, as well as other parts of the CRA. He added that the City has begun a new visioning plan, and he encouraged all present to attend the public

meetings that begin next week, at which the City's vision for all its neighborhoods would be shared. He recommended that the proposal be expanded in order to take advantage of more new opportunities, and invited the team to the Visioning Committee meeting.

Mr. Lambrix asked if the volunteers were aware of a Street Design Task Force within the City. Mr. Hooper said he had served on this task force, which looks at changes that will occur 40 years in the future. He observed that the proposed plan was "changing the pattern" by adding planting in the middle and off-peak parallel parking to existing streets. Mr. Powers explained that the volunteers were simply trying to plant the seeds for change in the streetscapes, and had only conceptual plans to offer before they work with City engineers.

Diana Alarcon, Director of Sustainability, said she would be willing to meet with the volunteers, and felt there were several good aspects of the proposal. She stated they could probably build from the proposal, as the Department recognizes that changes must be made to the existing Code structure in order to meet future transportation goals. She concluded that she would like to work with the proposed concept to determine where it can best be used.

Motion made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Ms. Burrows, that the Board supports in concept their overall plan and the direction that they're headed, but we reserve the right to make the final comment or recommendation when they have more of the moving parts pulled together and more details on cost and those types of decisions.

Mr. Battle recalled that the Board may submit this **motion** as a communication to the City Commission. Mr. Williams said he would like his **motion** to be submitted as such a communication.

Mr. Wilkes said he was not sure he understood the concept, although he encouraged the involvement of the community to proceed with activities that will promote development. He added that the concepts were consistent with the discussion the Board had had with the City Commission at their joint meeting in June: they had discussed the fact that they had funds and would like to do work on specific thoroughfares and promote connectivity.

Mr. Hooper said he was hoping the CRA would help them by sponsoring the project and working with Flagler Village to create a plan that considers zoning and parking changes. He reiterated his willingness to have the Department of Transportation and City engineers participate in the plan.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Action Item

IV. Funding Request – Northwest Gardens III

Mr. Strawbridge stated he would recuse himself from the Item.

Mr. Battle explained that this is the newest phase of the affordable housing project being constructed in partnership between Carlyle Development and the Housing Authority of Fort Lauderdale. The developer expects to spend \$32 million on this project, which is town home-style development. The project is located due south of Carter Park.

He advised that today's funding request is different from what has been presented to the Board in the past. The developer is requesting the CRA's support to help install enhanced streetscape improvements that look like the other improvements installed in the neighborhood as part of the Northwest Neighborhood Enhancement Project. These include light fixtures, landscaping, and on-street parking. Mr. Battle cautioned that if this request is not funded, the developer may install only the minimum amount of improvements in terms of lighting, landscaping, and sidewalk improvements.

He continued that the CRA has received Transportation Enhancement Grants to install these neighborhood-style improvements in this area. The most recent such grant was for \$900,000, while the previous grant was for \$300,000. He advised that the proposed improvements had always been planned for the neighborhood with grants combined with CRA funds. Mr. Battle concluded that Staff's recommendation is to provide \$510,000 in funds toward this project.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the improvements proposed by the developer would meet existing Code. Mr. Battle confirmed this. Mr. Gabriel observed that this meant the request was to exceed these proposed improvements in order to be consistent with existing improvements; the developer did not need to exceed this standard, but was requesting to do so for CRA purposes. Mr. Battle confirmed this as well.

Mr. Centamore commented that he did not believe he could approve the requested amount of money, and pointed out that these funds could be used better than for landscaping and streetscapes, such as by giving funds to small businesses to make improvements.

Mr. Williams said he also had an issue with the request. He recalled that the Board had approved past improvements on projects by the developer, although they have not seen a return in Tax Increment Financing (TIF). He asked if enhancements of this nature had cost similar amounts when the Board had approved them in the past. Mr. Battle said this was the highest amount

requested, but noted that the project is also much larger than previous projects for which requests have been granted. Mr. Williams stated that he did not feel it should cost the CRA half a million dollars to approach consistency with the existing streetscapes.

Ms. Adderley said her concern was also with the amount of money requested to achieve consistency with the existing streetscapes. She said she favored consistency, but felt the cost was high. She asked how much larger this project was than past projects. Mr. Battle estimated that it was five city blocks larger. Mr. Hinton said no one affiliated with the project had attended a meeting of the Durrs Homeowners' Association to discuss the proposed enhancements.

Ms. Burrows asked if the enhancements in the Northwest area were already in place when this project was approved. She explained if this was the case, the approval process for the development could have stipulated that the same lighting and other enhancements be used. Mr. Battle said while the developer was aware of the enhancements, the enhancements could not have been required.

Tam English, Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Fort Lauderdale, stated that the project was designed to meet Code and was accepted by the DRC as such. The enhancements are in excess of Code and were never designed into the project. He advised that the funding the Housing Authority receives for the project is sufficient to meet Code, which is very basic; for enhanced landscaping similar to what is seen at Dixie Court and Northwest Gardens I, additional funding would be required.

Mr. English advised that the Housing Authority and the developer do not have sufficient funding to install these enhancements. He added that there have been great changes in the community surrounding the Dixie Court project, and the Housing Authority felt these changes would be further enhanced by the requested improvements.

Mr. Centamore asked if a breakdown of the lighting costs was available. He added that the CRA was not receiving any TIF money from the project, and did not believe he could fund the improvements at the requested amount in good conscience.

Mr. Wilkes said he did not see sufficient detail between the fixtures planned by the developer and the proposed enhancements to make a difference; in addition, he asked how much of the CRA's budget they wished to spend on specific types of roadways, streetscapes, and landscaping, and how much money should go to non-TIF-related funding, such as public rights-of-way and housing. He stated that

he felt this request was premature and should be tabled until the Board can determine how it fits within their budget.

Mr. English noted that the CRA's Charter calls for enhancement of the neighborhood rather than improvement of its tax base. Ms. Adderley agreed with this, stating that the Northwest Gardens projects are included in the area to be redeveloped, but improvements in this area are not approved as readily as enhancements on Andrews Avenue or other areas might be.

Mr. Ernest-Jones agreed that while the Board could comment on design to a certain extent, their mission is to improve and promote projects that will help the area in general. He advised that they should recognize the Northwest area is "very risky" and the developer was taking a large risk in investing in that area. He felt landscaping would go a long way toward showing the care that is invested in a neighborhood; while the project might not add to the TIF revenues, it could encourage other projects to come to that area.

Mr. Gabriel said the improvements are permanent and would better the community. He said he would like to see what the CRA would be getting for its investment in terms of landscaping, and the difference its appearance would make to the community; however, he could not distinguish a before-and-after on the renderings provided.

Melissa Brillhart, representing the Carlyle Group, said they would be happy to provide a before-and-after account of the difference in landscaping. She said the developer has made a long-term investment in the neighborhood, and noted that Northwest Gardens III is actually the second phase in a larger master plan to transform an entire neighborhood. She concluded that landscaping makes a tremendous amount of difference to the streetscapes, and confirmed that the developer's property management group would assume responsibility for its maintenance.

Vice Chair Phillips said the Board should keep in mind that the developer has invested a great deal in the redevelopment of the CRA; however, she felt many of the points that had been raised were valid, and suggested that they invite the developer to come back at a later time and address these issues. She added that they should also take care not to get "stuck" in the Northwest section of the CRA and fail to move forward.

Mr. Williams requested before-and-after representations of what the landscaping would look like, with and without the proposed enhancements. He added that since he has been a member of the Board, they have acted consistently in approving the recommendations proposed by the Carlyle Group, and said he would like to see the results of some of these prior approvals as well.

Mr. Wilkes agreed that he would like to see some of the details of how the proposed enhancements would look. Mr. Gabriel said he would also like to see an option of somewhat reduced landscaping.

Mr. Hinton stated that homeowners own most of the property in the Durrs neighborhood, and there was not room for a great deal of landscaping or streetscape improvements. He suggested that the developer be asked to attend a meeting of the Durrs Homeowners' Association and show them the proposed enhancements.

Motion made by Chair Lucas, seconded by Mr. Williams, to defer. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 11-0. (Mr. Strawbridge abstained. A memorandum of voting conflict is attached to these minutes.)

Chair Lucas departed the meeting at 5:02 p.m. Vice Chair Phillips assumed the Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

V. Funding Request – ZOM Development, LLC

Nectaria Chakas, representing ZOM Development, LLC, explained that the request was for \$125,000 in funding as a local government contribution. The developer is required to demonstrate this contribution to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation in order to receive the funding they need to build an affordable housing project in the CRA. She noted that while many developers receive this contribution from Broward County, ZOM was unable to put the property put under contract within the County's funding cycle.

She advised that the property is located on the southwest corner of 7th Avenue and 3rd Avenue, and is roughly one acre in size. ZOM is proposing to construct a mid-rise affordable housing development. All units would be affordable and would be rented to individuals with income levels at 60% or less of the area median income for Broward County. She noted that ZOM has experience developing not only affordable housing projects, but attractive market rate housing as well.

She provided some conceptual site plans and elevations to show what the developer had in mind for the parcel, pointing out that the product style is similar to a nearby market rate development. The units range from studios to three-bedroom units, with town house units that wrap on 2nd Street.

Ms. Chakas advised that the assistance requested would be in the form of a loan from the CRA rather than a grant, as there would be tax implications on a grant. The loan would be a non-amortizing 32-year balloon loan, with a balloon payment at 0% interest at maturity. It would also include a provision for

forgiveness at the end of the term. This would allow the developer to use the entire \$125,000 toward hard construction costs. She noted that there is precedent for this type of loan as a local contribution, as the CRA Board had approved a similar loan for another affordable housing developer.

Mr. Williams asked how many developers were competing for the tax credit associated with the project. It was noted that at least one other project in the Flagler Village area is competing for this tax credit. Mr. Williams asked if the CRA would receive the \$125,000 back if the ZOM project did not receive this credit. Ms. Chakas said everything was contingent upon ZOM being awarded the credit from the Florida Housing Finance Corporation.

Mr. Williams noted that the 32-year non-amortizing loan would extend beyond the existence of the CRA, which sunsets in 2025. Mr. Battle said there would have to be an agreement that only 14 or 15 of the 32 years apply to the agency, and the City would then have to assume responsibility for the rest of the loan. Mr. Williams asked if the terms of the loan could be changed due to the sunset of the agency. Ms. Chakas said she did not know.

Mr. Wilkes agreed that the sunset of the agency posed an issue, and he did not feel the Board could obligate the agency past this time. He added that if the loan constituted a local government contribution, the term of the loan would make no difference.

Mr. Wilkes asked how many stories the project would be. Kyle Clayton, representing ZOM Development LLC, said it was eight stories high. Mr. Lambrix observed that this height would require City Commission approval. Ms. Chakas explained that anything between 55 ft. and 150 ft. in the RAC area is considered a conditional use and would require an additional level of review, which meant it would go before the Planning and Zoning Board.

Mr. Strawbridge asked how many units were planned for the development. Mr. Clayton said there would be 103 units for the market in general, with 10% of the units reserved for extremely low-income residents. This demographic was defined as individuals making 20% or less of the area median income.

Mr. Wilkes asked if this would be the only request for funding for this project, explaining that the Board often sees the same projects appearing before them multiple times to request more funding. Mr. Clayton said they did not have plans to make additional requests of the Board.

Mr. Williams asked if Mr. Battle felt comfortable with the Board voting on the request. Mr. Battle said he was, and stated that the request is contingent upon the developer's receiving an award. The Board would have an agreement crafted

to outline the terms of the loan, and would find out how the loan could be structured before the developer submitted the application for the award. If there was any challenge to the loan, the Board could discuss their options at the next meeting.

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Gabriel, that the Board approve the concept of providing a \$125,000 loan for the government contribution so this project can move forward, contingent upon their receiving the approval, and contingent upon their not coming back and asking for additional funds in the future, and contingent upon we can do it in terms that would be legally recognizably acceptable for this group.

Mr. Wilkes clarified that his **motion** did not give approval to the design concepts, and that he would like to see the design of the development come back to the Board at a later time. Ms. Chakas agreed, noting that they would need to meet with the neighborhood in the future as well.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

V. Small Business Incubator

Mr. Battle explained that Staff has discussed how to foster small business development in a way that supports new and existing small businesses at a rate of more than one at a time. One concept presented by Vice Mayor DuBose was the idea of an incubator program that could provide technical assistance or other services to small businesses. Mr. Battle said he determined that the CRA may want to do this by partnering with an entity in south Florida that already provides these services on a full-time basis.

An incubator provides help with business plans, access to financing, technical assistance, industry training, and general information, among other services. In south Florida, Florida Atlantic University (FAU) has a very successful incubator focusing on high-tech and light industrial businesses. Another incubator in Delray Beach focuses specifically on small business of various types. Mr. Battle said there is interest in placing an incubator in Fort Lauderdale.

In order to make this happen, the City would need to issue an RFP and solicit interest from vendors who provide this service, encouraging them to place the physical location of the incubator on Sistrunk Boulevard. The types of businesses the incubator would help have yet to be determined. He noted that the operator would need to decide what services the incubator would provide; Staff could help give him ideas of what would be most helpful to businesses in the area.

Mr. Battle emphasized that one service the CRA would want an incubator to provide is help in the development of a capital fund, which could provide capital to help a small business open or improve. They would help grow small businesses and become a long-range partner for the CRA. He concluded that Staff was asking for the Board's support in issuing an RFP for the solicitation of a small business incubator program.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the incubator would fall entirely within the umbrella of the CRA or if it would be a separate entity with which the CRA would have a close working relationship. Mr. Battle said the CRA would act as contract administrator, and would help provide the resources necessary for the program. He clarified that the incubator would not be dependent upon the CRA for all of its capital. While the CRA might have a higher contribution in the first year of an incubator program, this amount would decrease in subsequent years.

Mr. Williams suggested that the program in Delray Beach could provide a good model for Fort Lauderdale. He advised, however, that it is very hard to make these programs work because of capital issues. Most small businesses require support for an extended period of time, and these funds are not typically available through an incubator. He recommended giving a lot of thought to the best structure of such a program, as few of them accomplish their goals. Mr. Battle agreed with this.

Mr. Strawbridge noted that while most business incubators are facilitators connected with an institution or a lender, the Housing Authority has been successful without this association. He advised that local government is often in need of help from small businesses to complete their everyday tasks, and felt allowing local dollars to go into these businesses was a wise use of capital. He concluded that he was very enthusiastic about this approach.

Motion made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Strawbridge, to endorse the development of a small business incubator program within the CRA, with a preference to locate the program on the Sistrunk Boulevard Corridor. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

VI. Emergency Fire Protection Program

Mr. Battle said some small businesses within the CRA have indicated that fire violation issues are in danger of shutting down operations, due to the expense associated with resolving corrective actions to existing conditions. He has since learned from the Fire Department that a number of establishments, primarily restaurants, are being cited for violations ranging from extinguishing systems to ventilation control. He clarified that these violations refer to hood and fire suppression systems, which would require replacement of equipment and

electrical design changes. These improvements can be from \$10,000 to \$25,000 in cost.

Mr. Battle explained that this proposed program would be similar to the CRA's façade renovation program in terms of capital outlay and owner requirement. He advised that the Board would need to determine whether they want to create and capitalize such a program and provide it to restaurants. The proposal would be for the CRA to pay for the improvements as they are installed, as the businesses might not be able to raise the capital right away for installation.

He added that the CRA has a threshold limit in terms of delegated authority of expenditures. This means if the program is created under a disbursement threshold of \$25,000, they would be able to provide the money to the businesses at a quicker rate. The program would ask the Board for the delegated authority to approve applications. Businesses would be required to provide information including how long they have been in business, who their contractor would be, and the schedule on which the improvements would be installed, as well as insurance and other information from the property owner. The application process would also mirror that of the façade renovation program.

Mr. Battle concluded that the program would help some of the businesses that have recently been cited for fire Code violations. He advised that it would be a small investment to help keep these businesses afloat through grants to address improvements.

Mr. Centamore asked how the violations came about. Mr. Battle explained that systems are inspected annually; when a violation is found, the business is noticed and given a specific amount of time to comply. If the violation is not resolved in a timely manner, fines begin to accrue and the business could be shut down.

Mr. Williams asked if a limit would be set on the contributions. Mr. Battle said an annual allocation of \$100,000 to the program has been suggested; this might be increased if more requests come in. He advised that this amount is based on the four to five businesses that have come forward thus far.

Mr. Gabriel requested clarification on the maximum amount for which a business can apply. Mr. Battle said this would be \$25,000. He clarified that the applications would be limited to fire Code violations at this point, although the program could be amended in the future to address other corrective actions. He explained that the fire violations are seen as a trend. Ms. Burrows commented that she would like to see the program broadened to cover other internal Code violations in the future.

Mr. Lambrix said he would support a loan program at 0% interest, but felt the money should be paid back to the CRA. He advised that addressing various Code violations is part of the cost of doing business. Mr. Centamore noted that when word got out regarding the program, it could "open the floodgates" to prospective applicants. Mr. Battle said the prospective program is open to suggestions or modifications.

Mr. Strawbridge proposed that another type of contribution, such as a match, could be made part of the program. He expressed concern with a program that gave money to businesses with no interest and no expectation to pay it back, as he also felt this could open up the program to a great many requests.

Mr. Battle said the program would require a minimum investment of 5% from the business itself. Mr. Strawbridge advised that a balance could be struck between providing a grant and asking the owner to pay back the entire amount. Mr. Williams added that they should also consider the volume of business when asking a business owner to put some of his or her own money toward the improvement.

Mr. Wilkes said he agreed with helping businesses address Code violations, and felt the program could be expanded to violations other than fire and safety issues; however, he also felt there should be an obligation for repayment, so the money would be available to other businesses that might need it in the future. Mr. Centamore also agreed that money should be paid back. He pointed out that all businesses might not remain viable over a number of years.

Mr. Battle recalled that the façade grant was structured so both the business and the property owner were party to the agreement. This meant if the business failed, the property owner was obligated to a recapture provision. He said the same structure could be applied to the Code violation program.

Mr. Centamore asked how soon the businesses were required to address their fire Code violations. Mr. Battle said one restaurant was already before a Special Magistrate. Mr. Centamore asked if it would be possible to approve a grant or loan to that business and modify the program at a later time.

Motion made by Ms. Burrows, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve a recommendation establishing a CRA health and safety emergency corrections program.

Margarette Hayes, representing Betty's Restaurant, explained that this restaurant has already been cited and is past its deadline for corrective action. She said emergency assistance was needed in order for the business to remain operational, and the owner did not have the money on hand to make the

necessary improvements. Ms. Hayes said the business has been in operation for 35 years. She asked that the Board consider acting on this request at today's meeting.

Mr. Gabriel noted that the **motion** made no reference to a loan amount or 0% interest. Mr. Wilkes observed that the program as presented placed the business at no obligation to repay the loan. Mr. Gabriel said he was concerned with how other safety issues would be determined, as well as with "giving money away" at 0%. He felt this went beyond what was originally contemplated for the program without being able to control it. He said he would not object to setting up the program as originally proposed and expanding it at a later time.

Ms. Burrows explained that her intent was to address other safety Code violations, such as electrical violations. She felt there was no material difference between this safety Code and fire Code. Mr. Gabriel reiterated that he would not be comfortable voting for an expanded program. Ms. Burrows agreed that the program might be adjusted to address other safety violations at a later time, after the immediate issue of the cited restaurant has been addressed.

Mr. Strawbridge agreed that the program could be advanced with the proposed \$100,000 cap. He noted that there are many businesses that have Code violations, and pointed out that the question of what kinds of businesses should be supported would arise.

Mr. Ernest-Jones asked if the program, if approved for establishment at \$100,000, would allocate funds at Staff's discretion, or if each request would then come before the Board. Mr. Battle said Staff was asking to capitalize the fund and then have the authority to administer the program at Staff level.

Mr. Centamore asked if the \$100,000 allocation was for this year only, with no more funds until the next year. Mr. Battle said unless a tremendous need was seen to put more money in the program, the \$100,000 would be for this year.

Ms. Burrows **amended** her **motion** to remove the reference to health and safety. Mr. Williams accepted the **amendment**.

The **motion** was restated as follows: **motion** recommending that the CRA Board approve the CRA fire violations corrections program, to provide a maximum amount of \$25,000 per applicant, and approve allocating \$100,000 to this program from [the] CRA blanket projects account.

It was clarified that the terms of the program would be as stated in the document provided to Board members.

Mr. Gabriel commented that he had thought the **motion** would be amended to include an obligation for repayment. It was clarified that this was not part of the **motion**.

In a voice vote, the **motion** passed 8-3 (Mr. Ernest-Jones, Mr. Lambrix, and Mr. Wilkes dissenting).

VIII. Property Disposal Process Recommendation

Mr. Battle said this Item could be tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. Centamore and Mr. Gabriel left the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Discussion Items

X. Immediate Term Task Review

This Item was tabled until the next meeting.

XI. Director's Report

Mr. Battle advised that the CRA is now part of the City's new Department of Sustainability, which consists of Building, Planning, Housing and Community Development, Economic Development, and both CRAs. The reorganization is intended to help create greater efficiency when working on projects.

He noted that the groundbreaking date for the grocery store project on 7th Avenue and Sistrunk Boulevard is set for October 25, 2011.

XII. Communication to CRA Board

The communication was previously discussed.

XIII. Old / New Business

None.

XIV. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 6:10 p.m.